

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----	X	
	::	
LUKELYN CAMPBELL,	:	10-CV-1809 (ARR)(LB)
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	<u>NOT FOR PRINT OR</u>
	:	<u>ELECTRONIC</u>
-against-	:	<u>PUBLICATION</u>
	:	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	:	<u>OPINION AND ORDER</u>
	:	
Defendant.	:	
	X	

-----  
ROSS, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff, currently incarcerated at the Federal Medical Center ("FMC") Devens in Massachusetts, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed this action on April 15, 2010, claiming that in violation of the Federal Tort Claims Act, government employees, including Judge Sifton, Judge Sifton's case manager, several Assistant United States Attorneys, and Federal Bureau of Prisons personnel conspired to kidnap and assault him. By opinion and order dated May 3, 2010, the court dismissed plaintiff's complaint as frivolous pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)(1). On May 24, 2010, plaintiff appealed the denial of this order to the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit. By motions dated May 9, May 13, and May 14, 2010, plaintiff moved for reconsideration. By opinion and order dated May 27, 2010, I denied plaintiff's motions, finding that plaintiff failed to meet the strict standard for reconsideration.

By letter motion dated May 28, 2010, plaintiff once again seeks reconsideration of the court's prior order. As discussed in this court's most recent order: "The standard for granting [a motion for reconsideration] is strict, and reconsideration will generally be denied unless the moving party can point to controlling decisions or data that the court overlooked - matters, in

other words, that might reasonably be expected to alter the conclusion reached by the court.”

Shrader v. CSX Transp., Inc., 70 F.3d 255, 257 (2d Cir. 1995); see also Herschaft v. N.Y. City Campaign Fin. Bd., 139 F. Supp. 2d 282, 283 (E.D.N.Y. 2001). Plaintiff fails to meet this standard.

### **CONCLUSION**

As plaintiff has not alleged any facts sufficient to warrant relief from the court’s order, plaintiff’s fourth request for reconsideration is denied. Plaintiff is hereby informed that the court will not entertain any further requests for reconsideration of the instant action.

Accordingly, the Clerk of Court is directed to return without filing and without judicial order any future letters and/or motions under docket number 10-CV-1809(ARR), which seek reconsideration. The court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that any appeal would not be taken in good faith and therefore in forma pauperis status is denied for the purpose of any appeal. Coppedge v. United States, 369 U.S. 438, 444-45 (1962).

SO ORDERED

/S/

---

Allyne R. Ross

United States District Judge

Dated: June 10, 2010

Brooklyn, New York

SERVICE LIST:

Pro Se Plaintiff  
Lukelyn Campbell  
No. 72968-053  
FMC Fort Devens  
P.O. Box 879  
Ayers, MA 01432

cc: Magistrate Judge Lois Bloom